

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 02-1559**

---

JEFFREY E. JOHNSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON AIRPORTS AUTHORITY  
(MWA),

Defendant - Appellee,

and

JAMES WILDING, CEO; ELMER HUNT TIPPETT, JR.,  
Vice President for Public Safety; ARL  
WILLIAMS, Vice President for Human Resources;  
LEO J. ROSSITER, Chief of Police; MICHAEL  
CZLONKA, Deputy Police Chief support Services  
Bureau,

Defendants.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of Virginia, at Alexandria. T. S. Ellis, III, District  
Judge. (CA-01-1614-A)

---

Submitted: November 21, 2002

Decided: November 27, 2002

---

Before NIEMEYER, WILLIAMS, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Jeffrey E. Johnson, Appellant Pro Se. Morris Kletzkin, Mark David Crawford, FRIEDLANDER, MISLER, SLOAN, KLETZKIN & OCHSMAN, P.L.L.C., Washington, D.C., for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.  
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Jeffrey E. Johnson filed a complaint alleging employment discrimination in his termination as a police planner for the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority (MWAA) and in MWAA's failure to hire him for other positions. The district court conducted a hearing and granted summary judgment in favor of MWAA for the reasons stated from the bench. Johnson appeals. We have reviewed the record and the district court's statements from the bench. The court properly found that, even if Johnson could make a prima facie showing of discriminatory treatment, MWAA showed legitimate, non-discriminatory reasons for the adverse employment actions and that Johnson failed to show that the reasons were pretextual. Reeves v. Sanderson Plumbing Prods., Inc., 530 U.S. 133, 137-39 (2000). Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court as stated at the hearing on January 4, 2002. See Johnson v. Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority, No. CA-01-1614-A (E.D. Va. filed April 19, 2002 & entered April 24, 2002). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED